UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,322	08/19/2003	James M. Kadushin	374.1.0154	3954
WATOV & KII	7590 12/23/200 PNES.P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 247	•	ALEXANDER, LYLE		
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/643,322	KADUSHIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LYLE A. ALEXANDER	1797	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aband	onment of this
application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, wh	
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following	
periods:	ig time
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, which	ever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILE MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate	extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate	e extension fee
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, every	, , ,
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ii ii iiiileiy iilea,
NOTICE OF APPEAL	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 01 October 2009. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two	
the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismi	
appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 47	.37(a).
AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered becation. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	ause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the	issues for
appeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (P	ΓOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment	canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	lonation of
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	lanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-5,30 and 32-36</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be appear to the date of the date o	e entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is n	
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	•
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will	
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails	io provide a
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached	4
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	۸.
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance	hecause.
See Continuation Sheet.	, podauoo.
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	
13. Other:	
/LYLE A ALEXANDER/	
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Upon further appeal, the above amendments will be enter and the Office will vacate the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections that were made in the 3/30/09 Final rejection. Appellants traverse the 35 USC 102(b) rejections over Nova et al. on the grounds the references "may include a shell that is non-reactive ...". These remarks are not convincing because Nova et al. teaches other embodiements that have been described in the 3/30/09 Final rejection that properly read on the instant claims.